Daisy

Background
Prof. Roscoe suspected that the paper he received from Daisy, a Haverford senior in his Introductory Anthropology class, contained material from uncited secondary sources. Prof. Roscoe confronted Daisy about his concerns. Daisy admitted that she had used outside sources, and she agreed to contact the Honor Council Chair. Honor Council reached consensus that a trial was necessary.

Fact-Finding
Prof. Roscoe began the fact-finding session by explaining the nature of the assignment to the jury. Each student was expected to write a close textual analysis of a section from a primary source. On the assignment sheet, Prof. Roscoe explicitly stated that all secondary sources must be cited. This assignment sheet also provided guidelines for determining what should be cited and how it should be cited. Prof. Roscoe then explained to the jury that his reasons for suspecting that Daisy had used outside sources were grounded in the following evidence: 1) the use of sophisticated scholarly methods beyond the parameters of the course; 2) the use of obscure material that Prof. Roscoe wasn't familiar with; 3) a numbering system used to refer to the primary source inconsistent with that of the course; 4) the lack of continuity and coherence within the paper; 5) the inclusion of material that could only have been obtained through proficiency in the primary source's original language; 6) odd tense shifts (which led Prof. Roscoe to believe that material had been lifted from an outside source; 7) references to passages of the primary source not covered in class. With these suspicions in mind, Prof. Roscoe then told the jury he wrote a note asking Daisy to come to see him during office hours.

In the subsequent meeting, Prof. Roscoe asked Daisy for clarification on the discrepancies in her paper. Daisy admitted that she had used outside sources and had forgotten to acknowledge them; however, she insisted that she had not intended to plagiarize. Prof. Roscoe told the jury that Daisy was shocked by the allegations. Daisy then asked Prof. Roscoe if this situation could be handled within the department. Prof. Roscoe agreed to consult with another colleague and arranged a second meeting with Daisy.

Prof. Roscoe told the jury that he met with Daisy a second time on the next day. Prof. Roscoe did not remember much about the conversation, but he had a feeling that Daisy had not communicated fully the extent to which she had used the sources. Prof. Roscoe's overall impression was that Daisy did not understand the texts she had been using or the concepts involved in the paper. At this meeting, Prof. Roscoe asked Daisy to consult the Honor Council Chair.

Prof. Roscoe said that a third meeting took place the morning of the first day of the trial. Prof. Roscoe then concluded by telling the jury that he was convinced that Daisy had used material she did not understand. However, he did not know if Daisy had paraphrased or had lifted text directly from secondary sources.

Next, Daisy addressed the jury. She began by saying that this was her first Anthropology class, so she was new to the subject area. As a senior, she hoped to learn for the sake of learning, and therefore, she didn't care about her grade; she was taking the course pass/fail. She met with Prof. Roscoe before the paper was due because she didn't know where to begin the assignment. She didn't find the meeting particularly helpful so she went back to the text and read some more. Once Daisy had finally decided on a theme, she went to the library. Having been accustomed to incorporating other sources into her work, she went to the library with the intention of finding a firmer foundation for the paper. Daisy explained the lack of bibliography and citations by arguing that she had trouble differentiating privileged information from what was common knowledge because the subject area was so new to her. The awkward tense shifts Daisy attributed to bad grammar. She went on to explain that she had done her best to paraphrase the secondary sources, but she admitted that some words were taken directly.

After receiving her paper back, and reading the professor's comments, Daisy just thought that the professor had simply found her paper confusing. She said that when she visited Prof.
Roscoe the next day, as requested, it never occurred to her that she might be accused of plagiarism. Daisy described herself as being clueless as to what the professor was hinting at throughout most of the meeting. Daisy related to the jury that during the course of the meeting, she had admitted to using outside sources and failing to cite them. She presented the jury with five outside sources that she had used and a copy of her paper with highlighted areas indicating where she believed she had taken information from secondary sources. This covered nearly 75% of her paper. She provided the jury with the citation for one particular passage of her paper which she believed to have been paraphrased.

The jury then asked clarifying questions. The jury asked Daisy to explain her thesis and how she derived it. Daisy had some difficulty answering both questions. When the jury inquired about the origin of her thesis, Daisy was not able to answer. Daisy and Prof. Roscoe left for the evening and the jury began to deliberate.

**Deliberation I**

Each jury member felt that Daisy had violated the Honor Code. The jury examined the paper and discovered that nowhere had she acknowledged the secondary sources that she had consulted. There were some further points the jury made. First of all, Prof. Roscoe was explicit on the assignment sheet regarding paraphrasing and citing. Therefore, Daisy could not claim that she was ignorant of Prof. Roscoe's expectations for the incorporation of secondary sources in the assignment. Second, the jury was troubled by Daisy's inability to explain her thesis. Because Daisy exhibited poor comprehension of her paper topic, it did not seem conceivable that she could have written about it in her own words. Third, after examining the portions highlighted by Daisy, the jury found that part of the paper was copied directly from an uncited secondary source. The jury held that, while it could be possible to mistake historical tradition for common knowledge, copying an entire paragraph word for word could not be accidental. The jury came up with more questions not asked during fact finding: Did Daisy consult secondary sources before formulating her thesis? Why would Daisy plagiarize in a class taken pass/fail? Is it possible that Daisy was truthful and simply does not know how to cite properly? And, how much of the paper was plagiarized?

The jury tried to discern how much of the paper was plagiarized. No one on the jury was familiar with the topic of the paper, and everyone felt it was unproductive to go through the stack of Daisy's secondary sources. The jury determined that plagiarizing an entire paragraph is very serious in itself. The jury assumed that other highlighted areas of the paper were paraphrased or plagiarized.

Many of the other questions generated would be addressed during the circumstantial portion of the trial, and others the jury realized would probably never be answered. At this point, the jury reached consensus on the following violation:

**Daisy violated the Honor Code by plagiarizing large sections of her paper.** She copied text and paraphrased ideas from secondary sources and presented them as her own.

Next, the jury looked to whether Daisy had lied to the jury. Some jurors felt that no one could be so careless, and they believed that there must have been some intent to copy. If this was the case, then Daisy had lied to Prof. Roscoe and the jury when she said that she had not intended to deceive. It was inconceivable to some jurors that a senior could copy directly from a book and not realize that a violation had occurred until the professor asked her direct questions about secondary sources (i.e. Did you consult outside material when writing this paper?).

However, other members of the jury saw Daisy cooperating throughout the trial process. She had given the jury her secondary sources; she had answered every question; and she seemed willing to work with Prof. Roscoe and the jury. Also, it would be impossible to tell if she had lied to Prof. Roscoe during their second conversation because neither Prof. Roscoe nor Daisy had a good memory of it. The Chair reminded the jury that some questions would be unresolved, and, therefore, it would be impossible to reach consensus on whether or not Daisy was lying. The jury agreed that it was impossible to know if Daisy was lying.
Before the deliberations ended, the jury stated its concerns. Namely, it appeared that Daisy was unaware of the seriousness of her actions. In addition, it was difficult for the jury to believe that Daisy had simply made a careless error. Directly copying and incorporating one or more paragraphs from a secondary source into a short paper (therefore making the material seem like your own), seemed to be a deliberate, laborious act. The jury stopped for the night, keeping these points in mind for the circumstantial portion of the trial process.

Circumstantial

Daisy commenced the circumstantial portion of the trial by describing the conditions under which she wrote the paper. She restated that this was her first anthropology course and that she really tried to participate in class. Daisy reminded the jury that there was no motivation for her to plagiarize because she was taking the class Pass/Fail. Daisy told the jury how difficult the assignment had been for her. After she received the paper back, Daisy thought that Prof. Roscoe had some simple clarification questions for her. Daisy stated that upon reading Prof. Roscoe's comments, it just did not occur to her that she was suspected of plagiarism.

Daisy related that, during the course of the first conversation, she didn't know what Prof. Roscoe was getting at until he asked her directly if she had used outside sources. At this point, Daisy was overwhelmed and in shock. Daisy told the jury that the violation occurred without her intent. Daisy said that at no point did she deny what had happened. She maintained that she had only been trying to bring in different material to support her thesis, and, therefore, the confrontation had been somewhat of a shock to her integrity. Because she felt that Prof. Roscoe could not possibly know her character from only four weeks of classes, Daisy tried to explain what a good person she was. Daisy fully acknowledged that a violation had occurred; however, she explained that the *intent* was never there.

Daisy went on to explain that she had had one or two other papers and an exam due the same week as the anthropology assignment, as well as a job interview. In addition, her grandmother had been sick in the hospital, and a good friend of hers was seriously ill. Despite these stressful circumstances, Daisy had still wanted to do well on this anthropology assignment, as evidenced by the preliminary meeting with Prof. Roscoe. Daisy then described the violation as pure carelessness. She said that a breach of trust with the community was the last thing she ever wanted. Furthermore, she maintained that she had been completely honest throughout the trial process. Daisy expressed the difficulty she was having with both the violation and the trial because it all seemed so contradictory compared to who she perceived herself to be.

Next, Daisy answered the jury's questions. She said she knew the general topic of her paper before consulting secondary sources, but was lacking a detailed, refined thesis. The jury wanted to know why she didn't ask for an extension. Daisy explained that she had never asked for an extension at Haverford, and she felt strongly about keeping deadlines. The jury questioned her about her thoughts regarding her finished product when turning it in. Daisy responded that she had recognized that the paper was not her best work, and there was some confusion in her mind about the concepts introduced in her paper. Did she ever panic while writing the paper? While Daisy admitted that outside stress had definitely been a factor while working on the assignment, she emphasized that she was not under any time pressure because she had set a strict schedule for herself. Next, the jury turned to questioning her habits concerning citations. Namely, was she in the habit of adding citations to papers as she went along, or did she put them in after completing her papers? She answered that she usually cites as she goes along, and she also generally puts a bibliography at the end. The jury inquired if she had proof-read her paper before turning it in. She responded that she had proof-read it only on the computer screen, not in hard-copy.

The jury then shared Prof. Roscoe's suggested resolutions with Daisy. He wanted Daisy to somehow take responsibility for her actions. He said he would welcome a second attempt at the paper. He gave no further suggestions, stating that he would leave the decision of failure of the class and separation up to the jury. The jury asked Daisy for her own possible resolutions. Daisy wanted to apologize to the entire community in the form of a letter. In addition, she said
that she would like to work with HCOs in helping them to communicate to the entering first-year students the gravity of plagiarism. She felt that incoming students could greatly benefit from the knowledge of her experience. In terms of accountability, she was concerned that this incident would have negative repercussions on the rest of her class work. Daisy maintained that she still wanted to participate and contribute. In addition, she said that she would cherish an opportunity to rewrite the paper. Furthermore, Daisy said she wanted to apologize, in written form, to both Prof. Roscoe and the authors of the texts which she used without referencing. Daisy reiterated that the violation was unintentional, and she would appreciate a chance to discuss the incident in greater depth with Prof. Roscoe. The jury asked her if she would also be willing to consult with an English professor about the explicit rule for proper citation. Daisy said this would be fine. The jury asked if she would be able to graduate in May if she were to fail the class. Daisy responded that she needed this credit and would not be able to complete her requirements without it.

**Deliberations II**

The jury began with the questions of separation and failure because they were the most weighty consequences. They jury also needed to look at the two possible measures together due to the fact that failing would have huge repercussions on her graduation plans.

The jury began by examining section III.A.1 of the Honor Code:

> A gross act of plagiarism constitutes a student's withdrawal from the commitment to the academic honesty required by the Honor Code, and will normally result in separation from the community for at least one semester.

The jury also looked at past abstracts that were similar to this case: Zoe, Leon, Thurmond, Tuna, and especially Lola; all these abstracts were plagiarism cases where a violation was found. Many of these students were seniors. In these abstracts, all of the confronted students failed their course and half of them were separated. The jury looked at each of these cases for possible resolutions, and not as a complete list of options, or as precedent to follow.

Jury members were cautious about not making a "knee-jerk" decision. One juror felt that failing her would not accomplish anything. Additionally, some felt that it would be hard to fail her after she had put so much effort into the course. The jury also noted that if they recommended that Daisy fail the course, she would not be able to graduate on time. However, most of the jurors felt strongly that she should fail because it was such a big violation. Another juror said that she would be uncomfortable not failing Daisy. In the end, the jury held the position that it would be unfair if a dishonest student were able to pass when there was a possibility that an honest student might fail.

The jury then moved to a discussion of whether or not to separate Daisy. Some jurors felt separation would be beneficial in that it was evident from this incident that Daisy, for whatever reasons, was not making correct decisions; due to this fact, the jury was unsure whether Daisy was really capable of living up to the responsibilities of the Code at this time. The jury felt that there was something wrong with Daisy's inability to recognize that she had plagiarized to such an extent. Another reason to consider separation was that it might help her come to terms with what she had done. One juror said that maybe Daisy could not handle the academic pressure here and therefore could use some time off to regroup. Another juror felt that Daisy should be separated strictly on punitive grounds.

One juror was extremely hesitant to separate Daisy; he felt the jury was not thinking about the possible effects of separation on Daisy. Would it help her consider her actions or would it turn her into an embittered community member. The jury decided that as a body, it could not tell the future. Ultimately, the jury determined that the only thing they knew for sure was that Daisy was making bad decisions and time off would be appropriate.

After considering several possible options, it was recognized that there was nothing indicating the violation wouldn't be repeated; Daisy needed to be separated immediately. Most jurors leaned towards the initial option of an immediate separation (with withdrawal from all
other classes) and a return the following semester. The juror who had been uncomfortable with separation earlier now realized that Daisy could not be trusted to uphold community standards and did require some time off from Haverford. The chair expressed the belief that if Daisy knew that it was wrong to copy directly from sources before she wrote the paper and that she knew it was wrong after she wrote the paper, then part of her knew while she was writing the paper that she was committing a gross act of plagiarism.

At this point the jury decided to separate her for two reasons: 1) Extreme negligence, inability to make correct decisions, and failure to live up to the ideals of the Honor Code; 2) Inability to recognize that she knowingly, blatantly plagiarized to such an extent. Time off, the jury hoped, would hold Daisy accountable for her actions and give her time to think carefully about the incident.

The jury then looked at Daisy's suggested resolutions. Many jurors were unsure if Daisy understood proper citation techniques in textual analyses, and wanted her to meet with an English professor to discuss this. The jury felt a letter to the community would help to educate and repair the breach of trust with the community. The jury felt that it was unrealistic for Daisy to help orient first-year students to the Honor Code because it would involve a breach of confidentiality. Furthermore, the jury felt that the abstract itself and Daisy's letter would help educate everyone, not just first-year students.

Finally, the jury looked at the relationship between Daisy and Prof. Roscoe. Both parties indicated that they wanted to repair the breach of trust somehow, but neither was sure how this could be done. The jury felt that perhaps a mediated conversation would be a step in the right direction. Also, as both parties mentioned rewriting the paper, the jury left this as an option. The jury did not want to require it because it might be difficult with Daisy being separated.

After some further deliberation the jury reached consensus on the following resolutions which address education, repairing the breach of trust (between Daisy and Prof. Roscoe, and Daisy and the community), and accountability. One juror stood outside of consensus because she was ill and could not make it to the deliberation.

1) The jury recommends that Daisy fail the class.
2) Daisy will be separated for the remainder of the semester and may return no earlier than the following semester. Daisy will re-sign the Honor Code Pledge upon re-entering the community.
3) Daisy will meet with a professor in the English Department to discuss citation guidelines. This will be done within the first four weeks of her re-entry.
4) Daisy will address this experience in the form of a letter to the community. This will be completed by the time she returns to Haverford.
5) Daisy and Prof. Roscoe will take part in a facilitated dialogue within the next four weeks. This will be facilitated by one of the Honor Council Co-Chairs. In addition, the jury recommends, but doesn't require, that Daisy make a second attempt at the assignment.

The resolutions were presented to Daisy, who was clearly upset with the first two resolutions.

Administrative Review

Daisy appealed to the President of the College on substantive grounds. During this time, Prof. Roscoe thoroughly researched the content of Daisy's paper. He found an additional text Daisy had not brought to the trial. Prof. Roscoe discovered that Daisy plagiarized all but three sentences of her paper, most from this missing source. The President upheld the jury's decision.

Discussion Questions
1) Do you agree/disagree with the jury's decision?
2) Should Haverford offer a "citation seminar" as part of Freshman English?
Dear Community:

Although the last several months have been extraordinarily emotional and difficult, I have had time to reflect after my separation from Haverford about what happened. First, I want to apologize to the Haverford community. I never wanted to inflict dishonor upon the Code and those that abide by it.

I believe that I am a person who has tried to live by a certain set of principles and guidelines and one of those is honor. It was the Honor Code that attracted me to Haverford. I have always taken the Honor Code seriously and continue to do so. But unfortunately last year I violated the Code. I appropriated the words of others without giving credit. I committed plagiarism under the Honor Code, a very serious offense.

What I especially want to convey and what I have painfully learned, regardless of the circumstances involved, plagiarism can not be excused. There may likely be times when you feel overwhelmed, whether it be with your studies or personal issues, if so please seek assistance. However, you must nevertheless always be vigilant, disciplined, and accept personal responsibility for your academic work regardless of the pressures you face. Otherwise you may suffer severe consequences.

During this period I was fortunate in that I had the support of family and wonderful friends at Haverford. They do not dismiss plagiarism and understand how important the Honor code and Haverford was to me. I look back on this experience as something I regret fully and will not erase from my mind.

Sincerely,
Daisy